

A
378.716
N85-

EDUCATION OFFICE
INVESTIGATION.

A
378.716
N85-

Education Office Investigation.

MR. HUNT'S CHARGES AGAINST MR. ARCHIBALD.

EDUCATION OFFICE,
March 27th, 1877.

To the Honorable Provincial Secretary:

SIR,—I most respectfully submit for your consideration the following communication relating to certain difficulties known to exist in this office, and which I earnestly trust may receive your impartial consideration. The following statement will show that the conduct of Mr. Archibald, the present clerk in the office, has, I regret to say, entirely destroyed that confidence which I should ever have in one so closely connected with me in the discharge of my duties.

The charges which I prefer in the following paper are of a serious character, and from which it will be seen that Mr. Archibald has so abused my confidence and misunderstood his position as to use his connection with the office only to the prejudice of the department and to my very great annoyance and harm.

I have therefore to charge Mr. Archibald with the following infractions of his official duties, and respectfully request that you will cause such an investigation to be made in reference to them as in your judgment they demand. For convenience, I shall state my charges in the following order, and am prepared to submit the required proof when such may be called for:

1. I charge Mr. Archibald with having deceived me in disobeying my instructions with reference to printing required for the Education office, and thereby violating the order of the Government under which it was my duty to act.

2. Without my consent or knowledge Mr. Archibald took accounts from the office which were waiting the sanction of the Government for settlement, and submitted the same to the inspection of parties having no interest in them, and who were likely to use them to the prejudice of the Educational department.

3. In opening letters addressed to me in confidence on official business, and communicating the information thus received to

parties who used it to contravene arrangements and pending decisions, thereby rendering useless certain very important acts of the Council of Public Instruction.

4. Secretly, and without my authority, Mr. Archibald wrote official letters on business with which the Educational department should not interfere, and thereby exposed me to severe but unmerited censure.

5. Contravening, in the most unjustifiable manner, my legal acts by secret correspondence and by telegram, charging the expenses to the Education office, and in this unwarrantable way inducing the Council of Public Instruction to act upon petitions clandestinely circulated by Mr. Archibald himself, the Council assuming that such petitions were the voluntary expression of parties sending them, when such was not the case.

6. I charge Mr. Archibald with fraudulently taking from my office examination papers and retaining them several months. The said papers were in my care, and I alone responsible for their safe keeping. Of these papers I charge Mr. Archibald with making untruthful statements relative to the average on which licenses to teach were granted, and thereby aiming to throw discredit upon the integrity of the examination work.

7. I charge Mr. Archibald with stating that he was authorized by the Government to watch my official acts, to conceal certain papers and to have a general supervision, and to see that the duties of the office were conducted legally; this espionage being, as Mr. Archibald recently asserted, at the suggestion of the Government.

8. A constant and irrepressible disposition to meddle and interfere with things entirely foreign to the duties of his office as clerk, such interference being entirely subversive of all mutual confidence and of that coöperation essential to the successful discharge of the duties of the office.

9. Making improper uses of the Education office.

I trust the Government will take such prompt and active measures in this matter as may seem to be in accordance with the above-named facts.

I remain, etc.

MR. HUNT'S CHARGES AGAINST MR. ARCHIBALD RELATING TO BOOKS.

One of the charges formulated by me against my clerk is, that he contravened, and as far as he could by adverse interference, rendered nugatory the policy of the Educational office, which I was carrying out under the instruction of the Council of Public Instruction. The facts to which I refer in support of my charge are briefly as follows:

The booksellers in the city and county have made frequent

complaints of the unjust regulation in regard to the books prescribed, which gave to one firm in the city the monopoly of all the Readers supplied to the schools throughout the Province. This having been brought to the notice of the Council of Public Instruction, and a change in the books being deemed desirable on other grounds as well, they requested me to recommend a series of Readers that would be suitable for the Schools, and, at the same time, throw the supplying of them open to the competition of all the trade, free from any monopoly. I accordingly, after careful examination of a number of different works, recommended Collins' series, which the Council of Public Instruction accordingly prescribed. This decision I communicated to the various booksellers, who in consequence made large importations. During the time that this arrangement was in progress Mr. Archibald received and opened a communication addressed to the Educational office from the agent of Collins, and retained it in his possession for some time, and only delivered it up when necessary in consequence of a telegram enquiring as to the receipt of this letter, and which rendered further concealment on his part impossible. This letter was important as containing terms on which his Readers could be furnished.

The information thus obtained, I have reasons to believe from statements by Mr. Archibald made to me, he communicated to parties that had heretofore had the monopoly of Readers, and commenced intriguing to have books prescribed of which it was feared by other booksellers Messrs. McKinlay might continue to command the monopoly; and to that end, amongst other things, Mr. A. got up and circulated petitions in the city and country, praying the Council of Public Instruction to place on the list of prescribed books the Royal Readers, and wrote and telegraphed to influential parties in the country to get up and forward petitions to the same effect. The Council of Public Instruction acted on these petitions as if they were the voluntary and *bona fide* expression of the opinions of the signers of them, and by this means were induced to prescribe the Royal Readers, when, in fact, the whole thing originated with the book monopolists of Halifax or with Mr. Archibald himself, who thus used his office not only to influence parties against the action of the Council of Public Instruction, but to perpetuate a monopoly that had become odious to the trade generally and likely to be burdensome to the schools using the books.

It needs no comment to show that conduct such as this is insubordinate and unbecoming in the highest degree in one holding a subordinate situation, is subversive of all discipline, and renders nugatory the action of this office and of the Council of Public Instruction itself.

The Council will perceive that if such conduct be tolerated it would be impossible for the Superintendent of Education to carry into effect the instructions of the Council of Public Instruction, or at any time to prescribe books where such rivalry and jealousy

exist, or prevent the perpetuation of a monopoly which gives a favored firm advantages unfair to the rest of the trade, while its tendency is to enhance the price of books which, on every consideration, should be furnished to schools at the lowest possible rate.

MR. ARCHIBALD'S CHARGES AGAINST MR. HUNT.

To the Honorable the Members of the Executive Council of the Province of Nova Scotia :

GENTLEMEN,—In presenting for your consideration the accompanying document, embracing certain charges against the Superintendent of Education, I do so with the less hesitancy, and with the feeling that the less formality is necessary, that the chief facts upon which the charges are based, together with a superabundance of proof that they are indeed facts were submitted by me early in September last, to the notice and inspection of the Hons. Messrs. Hill and Robertson ; who, in token of their conviction of the enormity of the conduct of which the Superintendent was guilty, and of their want of confidence in his administration of the duties of his office, gave me written authority over him to the effect that thereafter I would be required to examine and compare the memos. of licenses to teachers with the envelopes of the examiners, and to see that they were correct before sending them out. In fact it is only within the past few days that the thought occurred to me that, after presenting such an expose of his conduct to the Premier and one of his ministry, it would be necessary at all to prefer any charge in writing, in order that the Government might regard the matter as formally before them for consideration and final adjudication. In the formal presentation therefore of the matter which I now make, I wish it to be understood that it is no new charge which I now prefer, but one of six months standing, reiterated in a more formal, consecutive and tangible form, and as such takes precedence of all other charges of later date, which, in consequence of my action on that occasion, and fearing similar disclosures in the future, any person or persons may have thought proper to prefer with a view to my prejudices, and if possible the setting aside of the charges which I then made.

I trust that the reasonableness of this view will be at once apparent, and that the virtual expression of want of confidence in the Superintendent of Education and whatever else is implied in the letter of the Premier to me of date September 12th, 1876, will be allowed to have their due weight as touching any deliver-

ance which the Government may, in the near future, give upon the subject.

I have the honor to be,

Your obedient servant,

SAMUEL ARCHIBALD.

Halifax, March 22nd, 1877.

HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA,

March 22nd, 1877.

To the Honorable P. C. Hill, Pro. Secretary, &c., &c., and Honorable Members of the Executive Council of Nova Scotia :

I, Samuel Archibald, Clerk of the Department of Education, in this Province do hereby impeach the Rev. A. S. Hunt, Superintendent of Education, of certain crimes and misdemeanors as follows :

First.—I charge him with having changed last summer the valuation which *two* of the Provincial examiners had given of the work of certain of the candidates who had gone up for licence to teach in our public schools, and thereby giving them higher grades of license than those to which they were entitled.

Secondly.—I charge him with having altered the figures on the envelopes of the candidates over the signature of *one* of the examiners, and thereby adding additional guilt to the maladministration of the duties of his office.

Thirdly.—I charge him with having concealed for a time certain envelopes mutilated by the changes which he had wrought upon them, until I was obliged to ask for them in the discharge of the duty imposed upon me by the Premier, Mr. Hill, to whose notice I had brought a knowledge of the facts contained in the two preceding charges.

Fourthly.—I charge him with having given me, not the original envelopes on which he had wrought his changes, but duplicates of them, with figures corresponding to the changes which he had wrought upon the original, and signed also by the Provincial Examiner.

Fifthly.—I charge him with having destroyed, as he thought, certain of the original envelopes which had contained the work of the candidates for license after he had procured duplicates of them according to charge No. 4.

Sixthly.—I charge him with having given and offering to give, the examination questions to candidates, and others to be given to candidates, previous to the date of the annual examination.

In addition to the above charges preferred against the Superintendent of Education, I am prepared to show that there are teachers now drawing \$150 per year from the Provincial Treasury, as teachers of grade B., who, had the provisions of the law been

complied with, could only have received licence of Grade D, which would have entitled them only to \$60 per year or \$90 less than the sum they are now in a position to draw.

PROVINCIAL TREASURER'S OFFICE.
Halifax, March 31, 1877

Present: Hons. P. C. Hill, Stayley Brown, D. McDonald, J. McKinnon, Robert Robertson, and Colin Campbell. Also, Rev. A. S. Hunt and Mr. S. Archibald.

The Council took up the first charge in Mr. Archibald's paper. Envelope No. 63, Station W, was submitted, the record of it made by Mr. Archibald not agreeing with the envelope. Mr. Archibald charges the Rev. Mr. Daly with collusion with Mr. Hunt, as the envelope now produced does not agree with the one from which he (Mr. A.) states that he made the record. Candidate's name, Seffie L. Hall. Mr. Archibald states that in his opinion Mr. Hunt's motive in changing the figures must have been to give the candidate a higher grade than her papers entitled her to.

Mr. Archibald submits envelope No. 24, Station G. Candidate's name, Miss Catherine McKenzie, of Baddeck, C. B. Mr. A. says he got the torn envelope out of the stove in the office, not in any regular set of papers. The envelopes are not submitted to me. The record accords with the complete paper, not with the torn one. The memo. was issued according to the complete paper. I first saw the complete paper a few days after I called the attention of the Government to the alterations.

Mr. A. produces Mr. Hunt's memo. on this case, showing 2 cases of misspelled words, whereas there should have been 13, as appears by the papers.

In the same case, Principal Ross's paper shows a total of 85. Mr. Hunt's memo. in the same case makes 105.

No. 98, Station W. Laleah Clark, of Kings County. Figures said by Mr. A. to be altered in Mr. Hunt's hand from 60 to 250. License was issued according to registry in the book.

Mr. Archibald also charges the following numbers as having been altered :

63, 66, 68, 69, 82, 78, 83, 97, 99, and 103—all of Station W.

66.—Altered; history from 20 to 30.

68.—10 misspelled words, only 5 taken account of.

69.—Lucy H. Eaton. Total as recorded 125; figures on envelope 175. Mr. A. says it must have been altered, *i. e.*, a new envelope substituted for the original; signed by Mr. Daly.

82.—A new envelope—misspelled words.

97.—9; only 6 in Mr. Hunt's memo.

99.—Hester A. Sprow, Cumberland County.

103.—Lucy I. Morell, Colchester County. Another case of substituted envelope.

Mr. Bishop examined: Was asked by Mr. A. to call in at his office, as he had something to show him—some time in October or November, as near as he can recollect. We compared several papers with a registry in a book, and found several irregularities, principally in misspelled words. Did not know what Mr. A.'s object was in asking me to be present. Cannot positively identify the book produced as the one in which the registry was made. Was present again a night or two afterwards.

Station I. No. 23. Misspelled words reduced from 12 to 6.

" No. 35. 3 misspelled words.

" No. 43. Grade made lower than it should have been.

" No. 45. 6 misspelled words instead of 9.

On charge No. 6: I have seen day after day examination papers taken out of the office by Mr. Hunt previous to the date of the examination. Miss Kate McIntosh, of this city, told him that previous to the date of the last examination she was in the office and told Mr. Hunt she was intending to go up for grade B, so as eventually to go up for grade A, and therefore wanted a high average on grade B, and that Mr. Hunt told her if she would come to the office he would give her the examination papers. Miss M. never went up.

Just before the examination of 1875 Mr. Mulholland assembled the class previous to the examination, and drilled them in the same questions which afterwards proved to be the examination questions.

Mr. Thos. Robertson told me last summer that Mr. Hunt had given him examination papers previous to the examination for a candidate in Barrington, and that there are many other cases of which he has suspicions, but which will require to be proved by the parties themselves.

The foregoing are all the charges.

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA,
April 18, 1877.

Present: Hons. P. C. Hill, J. McKinnon, Robert Robertson, and Alonzo J. White. Also, Mr. Hunt and Mr. S. Archibald.

Mr. Thos. Robertson produced by Mr. Archibald as a witness:

Examined by Mr. A.—In reply to question, Did you or did you not inform me that Mr. Hunt had given you examination questions prior to an examination?

Ans. I may have said so, but I cannot say it was prior to an examination. I do not remember the time at all. Cannot fix it.

Q. Did Mr. Hunt give you what he represented as examina-

tion papers as the questions belonging to next examination ?

A. Mr. Hunt made no statement about the nature of the papers I received at the time of receiving them.

Q. Did you receive from Mr. Hunt examination papers which he gave you to understand were the examination papers of the department for the approaching examination ?

A. I cannot say that Mr. Hunt gave me papers which were examination papers of an approaching examination. I did not know the contents and do not know to this day.

Q. Have you any reason to believe that Mr. Hunt gave you papers which were examination papers of an approaching examination ?

A. I think so, but have no knowledge of their contents. I asked Mr. Hunt how a person could get a license who failed in the examination, not knowing the mode in which licenses were granted. I asked him if a private examination could be held, or in any other way a license could be obtained. Mr. Hunt said come back before the examination and I will see what I can do for you. I went back and Mr. Hunt gave me some papers and made no observations. I think they were examination papers, but do not know. I sent them to a party to be given to a candidate. Some time after this, Mr. A. called me into the Education office, and showed me a number of envelopes on which the figures were altered, and which he said were altered by Mr. Hunt. In the course of our conversation I informed him of Mr. Hunt having given me what I believed to be examination papers.

Examined by Mr. Hunt :

I frequently got examination and other papers from Mr. Hunt of previous years for information. I cannot say that the papers given me were not old papers of a previous year's examination. I have no recollection of anything being said about keeping quiet. I decline to give the name of the party to whom I sent the papers, or that of the party for whom they were intended. My relations with Mr. Hunt have always been of a friendly character. I am not sure, but I think it was last summer that I got the papers referred to. I frequently received papers from Mr. Hunt—every year. He never refused me them. I often had enquiries made and got papers from Mr. Hunt.

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA,
April 19, 1877.

Present : Hons. P. C. Hill, Alonzo J. White, and Robt. Robertson. Also, Mr. Hunt and Mr. Archibald.

Mr. Archibald produces Miss McIntosh :

Examined by Mr. Archibald.—Mr. Hunt offered me every assistance in his power to make my examination successful ; about

the first week in May, 1876. I was then intending to go up for examination—which would be about July, and told me to come down to the office about three weeks before the examination, when the papers would be ready. I understood the papers for that examination. I never went for them, I never went up for the examination.

Mr. Archibald had given me a great deal of information about papers in the office, irregularities of Mr. Hunt, &c., and I very inadvertently said more than I intended about the facts above stated, and then told him the whole. I think the first time Mr. Archibald spoke to me about the irregularities was in April, 1876.

D. H. Burbidge examined by Mr. Archibald.—I hold grade A license; I obtained it in 1875. I cannot say that I saw any of the examination papers before that examination. At a distance I saw papers, but it was by mere accident, and not by design either on Mr. Hunt's or my part. I went into Mr. Hunt's office one evening just to see him and ask him about his family. I could not swear that they were examination papers or even papers of that year. Mr. Hunt was busy with papers; I could not tell what papers they were. I never solicited any assistance from Mr. Hunt, and he never was in a position to give me any.

I had no knowledge of the passages of Latin or Greek that were to be translated, nor of the passages of English to be turned into Latin or Greek, nor of any branch of the examination.

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Halifax, N. S., April 21, 1877.

Present: Hons. P. C. Hill and Robert Robertson. Also, Mr. Hunt and Mr. Archibald.

Miss Alice Maloan: I hold grade C license. I got this in July 1876. I had not the slightest idea of the examination questions before going up, nor of any portion of them. I never saw the papers until examination day. I took 100 marks in geometry. I did better than I expected. I took lessons from Mr. Bishop. I knew nothing of the questions in that particular branch before the examination; I did not regard myself as being particularly deficient in it; I knew it required a great deal of study.

Miss Thalia A. Maloan: I hold a license, grade C, obtained in July, 1876. I was not in the Education office before the examination; have not been for two or three years, except once just before the vacation ended; it was after the examination. I had no knowledge of the questions before the examination. No one ever handed me a set of the questions. No papers were sent to me by mail or in any way whatever. Before the date of the examination I never saw any of the papers. I never knew any person to have had papers given to them: never heard of such a thing till to-day.

Joseph McLaughlin, of Albro street school: I hold a license, grades A and B. I obtained grade A in 1875. I have nothing to do with preparing the questions for examination. I don't know whose duty it is. I know nothing whether Mr. Hunt has obtained these questions with or without assistance. I never prepared any questions and submitted them to the Superintendent. I never had a copy of the questions before any examination, or of any part of them. I know nothing of Mr. Hunt getting people to prepare questions for him. I know nothing of any teachers going up for examination who had received copies of the questions; never heard of any such thing.

Aveline McCulloch: I hold a license, grade B. Held grade C before going up for grade B. I got grade C the last examination in Mr. Rand's time. Mr. Hunt's name is on the license, as he came in immediately after. Mr. Hunt came in in February 1870. At that time there were two examinations in the year—one in September and one in March. Mr. Rand held the examinations in September before I came, but issued no licenses; I do not think more than one or two at the utmost. I had the memo. from Mr. Rand, but not a license. It was written on the memo. that the Inspector of the County, Mr. Welton, had stated that I had used text books at my examination. Mr. Rand did not refuse to give me a license.

Mr. Welton's letter is produced: he does not state the charge on his own authority, or as having been a witness of it.

I obtained grade B in 1875. I did not see any of the examination questions previous to the examination, nor had I any knowledge of the questions. I did not know anything about the questions till I went up for examination, and Mr. Condon handed them to me.

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,

Halifax, N. S., April 27, 1877.

Present: Hons. P. C. Hill, Colin Campbell, Donald McDonald, Robert Robertson, and Alonzo J. White. Also, Mr. Archibald.

Mr. Archibald produces certain M. S. questions of an examination of 1871, written in Mr. Major's and Mr. McLaughlin's hand writing; also, the printed questions of the same examination corresponding with the M. S. questions. These were in possession of a party—not those who prepared them. This Mr. A. submits is a state of things which should not exist.

Mr. Donald Archibald stated that he had obtained the above papers from a Mr. Smith about a week ago: I knew nothing about them until Mr. Smith handed them to me.

Over two years ago my attention was first called to irregularities in the examination papers; my brother called my attention to these matters. At that time I counselled him to say nothing about it; I did not want to make any trouble, until September last

the papers then shown to me appeared to me most extraordinary, the irregularities were so glaring that I then advised him to acquaint the Government. The papers more immediately brought to my notice were principally from the Normal School, Station W. I was shown the record of those papers which was taken when they came into the office; I was then shown the envelopes with mutilations. After the memos. were made out I was shown the two sets, one made by Mr. Hunt and one by my brother from the record. The two sets did not agree, these were papers of examination of 1876. I think it was the same week, but won't be positive about the time, that my brother showed me three envelopes torn, which he said he got from the stove, and which corresponded with three sets then in the office, *i. e.* they were mutilated, and the changed figures corresponded with those on file. My attention was called to the papers three or four times in all, but the record did not agree with the figures as altered, but as originally made by the examiners.

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Halifax, N. S., June 5, 1877.

Present: Hons. P. C. Hill, Colin Campbell, Robert Robertson, and Alonzo J. White. Also, Mr. Hunt and Mr. Archibald. Rev. Mr. Daly was also present.

Mr. Hunt opened his defence, and called upon Mr. Daly to state whether he had altered envelopes at the request of Mr. Hunt.

Mr. Archibald states that he made no specific charge against Mr. Daly; he merely stated that certain papers had been duplicated; now, he did not know.

Mr. Robertson stated that after Mr. Brown's death he came in twice into the Treasurer's office and looked over papers; afterwards he came in with Mr. Hunt for the same purpose, but could not find what he wanted, *i. e.*, the torn envelopes.

Mr. Daly stated, in reply to Mr. Archibald's statement, that if any papers were duplicated, they must either have been forgeries or papers of another year.

Mr. Archibald being asked if he had any questions to ask Mr. Daly, replied that he had none.

Mr. Hunt then submitted a written statement.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Mr. Hunt called Mr. McLaughlin, of the Albro street school, as a witness, and submitted to him the papers previously put in evidence as received from Mr. Smith. Some of these papers I am familiar with; some I am not. I wrote some questions like these for a teacher at his own request; that teacher was going up to

an examination, and was naturally anxious to get all the information he could. This writing was done from five to seven years ago: they were copied from the printed ones *after* the examination. They were written at the request of the teacher. If I had a printed copy I would not have parted with it, as it might be the only copy left. There is only one copy printed and bound for the office, and one for each of the examiners. The questions are old ones, written after the examination.

Mr. Hunt then proceeded to state his charges against Mr. Archibald.

Mr. Hunt submits a letter from Mr. McDonald, the agent of Collins, of Glasgow, bookseller, dated 18th September, 1876; and also a telegram from the same, dated 28th September, enquiring why no answer had been received to his letter, which was addressed to the Secretary of the Education Office, Halifax, and which Mr. Hunt stated he had not seen when the telegram arrived, which Mr. Archibald had opened and kept to himself.

Also submits a letter from Dr. Farish, Inspector at Yarmouth.

Also, telegrams from Mr. Archibald to Dr. Farish.

Also, telegrams from Mr. Archibald to Mr. Calkin.

Also, telegrams from Mr. Archibald to Mr. McDonald.

Also, telegrams from Mr. Archibald to Mr. McKay.

These telegrams were charged to the Government, but Mr. Archibald subsequently repaid the amount paid for the same.

Mr. Hunt submits bill from telegraph office.

Mr. Hunt puts in a letter from the booksellers of Halifax.

Also, a written statement relative to the books.

Mr. Hunt also complained that in the matter of the Dartmouth controversy with the county about the school assessment, Mr. Archibald had interfered improperly, by writing letters on official paper to various parties, of which the Warden of Dartmouth and other Justices of the Peace complained in very strong terms.

Mr. Hunt also complained that Mr. Archibald had taken papers out of the office and kept them for a long time.

Mr. Archibald stated, in reply, that he had nothing to say in reference to Mr. Hunt's charges; that there was a certain basis of truth in the statements, but that they were exaggerated and not true to the extent urged by Mr. Hunt; and that he (Mr. A.) attached very little weight to them in any case, and left the whole case to the Council of Public Instruction.

MR. HUNT'S PROOFS.

TELEGRAMS.

HALIFAX, November 7th, 1876.

To G. J. FARISH, M. D., Inspector, Yarmouth :

Please send with your own, names of such teachers and others
for petition to Council to-day, as want Royal Readers on pre-
scribed list.

SAMUEL ARCHIBALD.

HALIFAX, November 7th, 1876.

To J. B. CALKIN, Esq., Truro :

Please send with your own, names of such teachers and others
for petition to Council to-day, as want Royal Readers on pre-
scribed list.

SAMUEL ARCHIBALD.

HALIFAX, November 7th, 1876.

To D. McDONALD, Inspector, New Glasgow, or, if absent, Princi-
pal of School :

Please send with your own, names of such teachers or others
for petition to Council to-day, as want Royal Readers on pre-
scribed list.

SAMUEL ARCHIBALD.

HALIFAX, November 7th, 1876.

To Mr. MCKAY, Principal of Academy, Pictou :

Please send with your own, names of such persons for petition
to Council to day, as want Royal Readers on prescribed list.

SAMUEL ARCHIBALD.

RECEIPT FOR TELEGRAMS.

HALIFAX, N. S., 1st March, 1877.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT to WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH CO. Dr.

For telegrams sent and received during the month ended 28th February, 1877.....	\$1.85
Amount refunded by Mr. Archibald.....	1.50

 \$0.35

Received payment.

Certified per GEO. LESLIE, Cashier.

LETTER FROM THE BOOKSELLERS OF HALIFAX.

HALIFAX, January 30, 1877.

SIR,—Having learnt from good authority that a clerk in your office has taken undue advantage of his responsible position and acquaintance with the private business of the office, to enter into correspondence with Teachers and others for the purpose of influencing the sale of a particular School Book, without your knowledge or approval, implying thereby that you were privy to his proceedings, and believing that there exists in Halifax a nefarious design to perpetuate the present Book monopoly, in spite of your endeavors to restrict it, and that the reprehensible conduct we have alluded to is intended to favor that design :

The undersigned beg to remind you, that agreeably to a resolution of the Council of Public Instruction prescribing the Collins' Series of Readers, and at your request, they have imported largely of that Series; but regret to say by a subsequent action of the Council, apparently in the interests of the monopoly, the Royal Readers were entered upon the prescribed list; thereby placing in jeopardy the use and sale of the excellent Series which had previously been adopted and stultifying their own action; and they look with surprise and indignation upon the conduct of your clerk, by which their interests have been tampered with, and the integrity of your office sacrificed in a culpable manner.

They cannot believe for a moment that you at all approve of such proceedings, injurious to educational morality, confirming and strengthening rather than abating the existing monopoly, and ignoring the scope and effect of the resolution of the Council of Public Instruction, under which at your personal request, and with a view to meet the exigencies of probable demand, they have acted, and they therefore hope, and have a right to expect, that you will make strict enquiry into the allegations against your clerk, and take such other measures as are necessary to lay before the Council of Public Instruction the true merits of the case, and so to preserve the integrity of your office and the just rights of all concerned.

We remain, Rev. Sir,

Yours respectfully,

WILLIAM GOSSIP.

M. A. BUCKLEY & Co.

THOS. P. CONNOLLY.

A. W. NICHOLSON.

The Rev.

The Superintendant of Education.

LETTER FROM MR. COLLINS.

*Dr. Wm. Murray, "Mountain View,"
Lynchburgh, Campbell Co., Virginia,
September 18th, 1876.* }

DEAR SIR,—Referring to my communication dated 14th of this month regarding series of school books published by our firm, I have just been advised that a new and enlarged edition of the "New Illustrated English Readers" have just been published, a sample set of which we shall be glad to send you for inspection.

It has occurred to me, that instead of waiting for a reply from Glasgow, should there be any information you may desire to have and in my power to furnish, I shall be glad to reply at once to any communication you may favor me with at above address.

I shall have occasion to visit Halifax on business connected with our firm late in November of this year, when I shall have the pleasure of waiting upon you. Should you prefer to see me earlier, however, I could without the slightest personal inconvenience proceed to Halifax at once, and if my doing so would in any way facilitate deliberations on the subject, I would much prefer to wait upon you now.

A reply by return mail to above address, if convenient, would greatly oblige.

We are, dear Sir,

Your obedient servants,

(p. p.)

WM. COLLINS, SONS & Co.

(Signed)

JAMES McDONALD.

The Secretary Education Office,
Halifax, N. S.

LYNCHBURGH, VA., 28th September, 1876.

Secretary Education Office, Halifax :

Please answer letter whether my presence in Halifax would be useful now.

JAMES McDONALD.

LETTER FROM DR. FARISH.

YARMOUTH, December 26, 1876.

Rev. A. S. HUNT :

My Dear Sir,—I have just received your note respecting the Reading Books, and must confess that I am puzzled what to think

of it, in the face of a telegram from the Education office, of Dec. 6. I will just tell you the whole story, perhaps you can unravel the whole mystery. If I have in any way acted contrary to your wishes, be assured I thought I was complying with your orders.

About the 1st September, I received from Mackinlay, a parcel containing a set of the Royal Readers, 1 to 6 inclusive, and a set of the Wall Cards, with a request to introduce them into the Schools, stating *I think*, that they would be prescribed. I have mislaid the letter and am not sure of his words. However, under the impression that they were to be prescribed, I went to the Bookseller and asked him if he would import them; he said, "decidedly not; he had a cart-load of Nelson's on hand, and he wished to get rid of them first; he would do nothing to injure the sale of those on hand; he was willing to *exchange* with Mackinlay for the new ones, nothing else." I wrote to Mackinlay, and so did the Bookseller to that effect, and there the whole matter dropped.

During the autumn I frequently spoke to all the teachers of the Town Schools about the books, and they unanimously expressed themselves pleased to have an addition from which to select reading books, *as soon as they were prescribed*. I had only once accidentally heard of the Collins' Series, and did not suppose they would ever be introduced here. I concluded we had to deal only with the Royal Readers or the old Nelson Series.

While in this state of uncertainty, I received the following telegram:—

HALIFAX, Dec. 6, 1876.

To G. J. Farish, M. D., Inspector :

Please send, with your own, names of such teachers and others for petition to Council to-day, as want Royal Readers on prescribed list.

SAMUEL ARCHIBALD.

I received it on the morning of the 7th, and believed I would be too late; but as I *might not* be, I resolved to send the names of those teachers with whom I had conversed, and who expressed themselves desirous of having the books. I thought that the Council of Public Instruction might not have met on the 6th, but I had no time to see them, and therefore immediately telegraphed as follows:—

"Inspector, G. J. Farish; Teachers, A. Cameron, J. Munro, J. Mackay, M. Webster, L. Goudey, A. Starratt, M. Starratt, E. Young, M. Woodworth, J. Page, H. Crosby, M. Taylor, D. Landers, H. Ellis, L. Bent, J. Harrison, A. Trask, E. Killam, R. Woodworth."

This course I believed to be in accordance with your own wishes, and that you required that the Royal Readers should be placed on the prescribed list.

the first week in May, 1876. I was then intending to go up for examination—which would be about July, and told me to come down to the office about three weeks before the examination, when the papers would be ready. I understood the papers for that examination. I never went for them, I never went up for the examination.

Mr. Archibald had given me a great deal of information about papers in the office, irregularities of Mr. Hunt, &c., and I very inadvertently said more than I intended about the facts above stated, and then told him the whole. I think the first time Mr. Archibald spoke to me about the irregularities was in April, 1876.

D. H. Burbidge examined by Mr. Archibald.—I hold grade A license; I obtained it in 1875. I cannot say that I saw any of the examination papers before that examination. At a distance I saw papers, but it was by mere accident, and not by design either on Mr. Hunt's or my part. I went into Mr. Hunt's office one evening just to see him and ask him about his family. I could not swear that they were examination papers or even papers of that year. Mr. Hunt was busy with papers; I could not tell what papers they were. I never solicited any assistance from Mr. Hunt, and he never was in a position to give me any.

I had no knowledge of the passages of Latin or Greek that were to be translated, nor of the passages of English to be turned into Latin or Greek, nor of any branch of the examination.

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Halifax, N. S., April 21, 1877.

Present: Hons. P. C. Hill and Robert Robertson. Also, Mr. Hunt and Mr. Archibald.

Miss Alice Maloan: I hold grade C license. I got this in July 1876. I had not the slightest idea of the examination questions before going up, nor of any portion of them. I never saw the papers until examination day. I took 100 marks in geometry. I did better than I expected. I took lessons from Mr. Bishop. I knew nothing of the questions in that particular branch before the examination; I did not regard myself as being particularly deficient in it; I knew it required a great deal of study.

Miss Thalia A. Maloan: I hold a license, grade C, obtained in July, 1876. I was not in the Education office before the examination; have not been for two or three years, except once just before the vacation ended; it was after the examination. I had no knowledge of the questions before the examination. No one ever handed me a set of the questions. No papers were sent to me by mail or in any way whatever. Before the date of the examination I never saw any of the papers. I never knew any person to have had papers given to them: never heard of such a thing till to-day.

Joseph McLaughlin, of Albion street school: I hold a license, grades A and B. I obtained grade A in 1875. I have nothing to do with preparing the questions for examination. I don't know whose duty it is. I know nothing whether Mr. Hunt has obtained these questions with or without assistance. I never prepared any questions and submitted them to the Superintendent. I never had a copy of the questions before any examination, or of any part of them. I know nothing of Mr. Hunt getting people to prepare questions for him. I know nothing of any teachers going up for examination who had received copies of the questions; never heard of any such thing.

Aveline McCulloch: I hold a license, grade B. Held grade C before going up for grade B. I got grade C the last examination in Mr. Rand's time. Mr. Hunt's name is on the license, as he came in immediately after. Mr. Hunt came in in February 1870. At that time there were two examinations in the year—one in September and one in March. Mr. Rand held the examinations in September before I came, but issued no licenses; I do not think more than one or two at the utmost. I had the memo. from Mr. Rand, but not a license. It was written on the memo. that the Inspector of the County, Mr. Welton, had stated that I had used text books at my examination. Mr. Rand did not refuse to give me a license.

Mr. Welton's letter is produced; he does not state the charge on his own authority, or as having been a witness of it.

I obtained grade B in 1875. I did not see any of the examination questions previous to the examination, nor had I any knowledge of the questions. I did not know anything about the questions till I went up for examination, and Mr. Condon handed them to me.

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Halifax, N. S., April 27, 1877.

Present: Hons. P. C. Hill, Colin Campbell, Donald McDonald, Robert Robertson, and Alonzo J. White. Also, Mr. Archibald.

Mr. Archibald produces certain M. S. questions of an examination of 1871, written in Mr. Major's and Mr. McLaughlin's hand writing; also, the printed questions of the same examination corresponding with the M. S. questions. These were in possession of a party—not those who prepared them. This Mr. A. submits is a state of things which should not exist.

Mr. Donald Archibald stated that he had obtained the above papers from a Mr. Smith about a week ago; I knew nothing about them until Mr. Smith handed them to me.

Over two years ago my attention was first called to irregularities in the examination papers; my brother called my attention to these matters. At that time I counselled him to say nothing about it; I did not want to make any trouble, until September last

the papers then shown to me appeared to me most extraordinary, the irregularities were so glaring that I then advised him to acquaint the Government. The papers more immediately brought to my notice were principally from the Normal School, Station W. I was shown the record of those papers which was taken when they came into the office; I was then shown the envelopes with mutilations. After the meins. were made out I was shown the two sets, one made by Mr. Hunt and one by my brother from the record. The two sets did not agree, these were papers of examination of 1876. I think it was the same week, but won't be positive about the time, that my brother showed me three envelopes torn, which he said he got from the stove, and which corresponded with three sets then in the office, *i. e.* they were mutilated, and the changed figures corresponded with those on file. My attention was called to the papers three or four times in all, but the record did not agree with the figures as altered, but as originally made by the examiners.

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

Halifax, N. S., June 5, 1877.

Present: Hons. P. C. Hill, Colin Campbell, Robert Robertson, and Alonzo J. White. Also, Mr. Hunt and Mr. Archibald. Rev. Mr. Daly was also present.

Mr. Hunt opened his defence, and called upon Mr. Daly to state whether he had altered envelopes at the request of Mr. Hunt.

Mr. Archibald states that he made no specific charge against Mr. Daly; he merely stated that certain papers had been duplicated; how, he did not know.

Mr. Robertson stated that after Mr. Brown's death he came in twice into the Treasurer's office and looked over papers; afterwards he came in with Mr. Hunt for the same purpose, but could not find what he wanted, *i. e.*, the torn envelopes.

Mr. Daly stated, in reply to Mr. Archibald's statement, that if any papers were duplicated, they must either have been forgeries or papers of another year.

Mr. Archibald being asked if he had any questions to ask Mr. Daly, replied that he had none.

Mr. Hunt then submitted a written statement.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Mr. Hunt called Mr. McLaughlin, of the Albro street school, as a witness, and submitted to him the papers previously put in evidence as received from Mr. Smith. Some of these papers I am familiar with; some I am not. I wrote some questions like these for a teacher at his own request; that teacher was going up to

an examination, and was naturally anxious to get all the information he could. This writing was done from five to seven years ago; they were copied from the printed ones *after* the examination. They were written at the request of the teacher. If I had a printed copy I would not have parted with it, as it might be the only copy left. There is only one copy printed and bound for the office, and one for each of the examiners. The questions are old ones, written after the examination.

Mr. Hunt then proceeded to state his charges against Mr. Archibald.

Mr. Hunt submits a letter from Mr. McDonald, the agent of Collins, of Glasgow, bookseller, dated 18th September, 1876; and also a telegram from the same, dated 28th September, enquiring why no answer had been received to his letter, which was addressed to the Secretary of the Education Office, Halifax, and which Mr. Hunt stated he had not seen when the telegram arrived, which Mr. Archibald had opened and kept to himself.

Also submits a letter from Dr. Farish, Inspector at Yarmouth.

Also, telegrams from Mr. Archibald to Dr. Farish.

Also, telegrams from Mr. Archibald to Mr. Calkin.

Also, telegrams from Mr. Archibald to Mr. McDonald.

Also, telegrams from Mr. Archibald to Mr. McKay.

These telegrams were charged to the Government, but Mr. Archibald subsequently repaid the amount paid for the same.

Mr. Hunt submits bill from telegraph office.

Mr. Hunt puts in a letter from the booksellers of Halifax.

Also, a written statement relative to the books.

Mr. Hunt also complained that in the matter of the Dartmouth controversy with the county about the school assessment, Mr. Archibald had interfered improperly, by writing letters on official paper to various parties, of which the Warden of Dartmouth and other Justices of the Peace complained in very strong terms.

Mr. Hunt also complained that Mr. Archibald had taken papers out of the office and kept them for a long time.

Mr. Archibald stated, in reply, that he had nothing to say in reference to Mr. Hunt's charges, that there was a certain basis of truth in the statements, but that they were exaggerated and not true to the extent urged by Mr. Hunt; and that he (Mr. A.) attached very little weight to them in any case, and left the whole case to the Council of Public Instruction.

MR. HUNT'S PROOFS.

TELEGRAMS.

HALIFAX, November 7th, 1876.

To G. J. FARISH, M. D., Inspector, Yarmouth :

Please send with your own, names of such teachers and others
for petition to Council to-day, as want Royal Readers on pre-
scribed list.

SAMUEL ARCHIBALD.

HALIFAX, November 7th, 1876.

To J. B. CALKIN, Esq., Truro :

Please send with your own, names of such teachers and others
for petition to Council to-day, as want Royal Readers on pre-
scribed list.

SAMUEL ARCHIBALD.

HALIFAX, November 7th, 1876.

To D. McDONALD, Inspector, New Glasgow, or, if absent, Princip-
pal of School :

Please send with your own, names of such teachers or others
for petition to Council to-day, as want Royal Readers on pre-
scribed list.

SAMUEL ARCHIBALD.

HALIFAX, November 7th, 1876.

To Mr. MCKAY, Principal of Academy, Pictou :

Please send with your own, names of such persons for petition
to Council to day, as want Royal Readers on prescribed list.

SAMUEL ARCHIBALD.

RECEIPT FOR TELEGRAMS.

HALIFAX, N. S., 1st March, 1877.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT to WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH CO. *Dr.*

For telegrams sent and received during the month ended 28th February, 1877.....	81.85
Amount refunded by Mr. Archibald.....	1.50

 \$0.35

Received payment.

Certified per GEO. LESLIE, Cashier.

LETTER FROM THE BOOKSELLERS OF HALIFAX.

HALIFAX, January 30, 1877.

SIR,—Having learnt from good authority that a clerk in your office has taken undue advantage of his responsible position and acquaintance with the private business of the office, to enter into correspondence with Teachers and others for the purpose of influencing the sale of a particular School Book, without your knowledge or approval, implying thereby that you were privy to his proceedings, and believing that there exists in Halifax a nefarious design to perpetuate the present Book monopoly, in spite of your endeavors to restrict it, and that the reprehensible conduct we have alluded to is intended to favor that design:

The undersigned beg to remind you, that agreeably to a resolution of the Council of Public Instruction prescribing the Collins' Series of Readers, and at your request, they have imported largely of that Series; but regret to say by a subsequent action of the Council, apparently in the interests of the monopoly, the Royal Readers were entered upon the prescribed list; thereby placing in jeopardy the use and sale of the excellent Series which had previously been adopted and stultifying their own action; and they look with surprise and indignation upon the conduct of your clerk, by which their interests have been tampered with, and the integrity of your office sacrificed in a culpable manner.

They cannot believe for a moment that you at all approve of such proceedings, injurious to educational morality, confirming and strengthening rather than abating the existing monopoly, and ignoring the scope and effect of the resolution of the Council of Public Instruction, under which at your personal request, and with a view to meet the exigencies of probable demand, they have acted, and they therefore hope, and have a right to expect, that you will make strict enquiry into the allegations against your clerk, and take such other measures as are necessary to lay before the Council of Public Instruction the true merits of the case, and so to preserve the integrity of your office and the just rights of all concerned.

We remain, Rev. Sir

Yours respectfully,

WILLIAM GOSSIP

M. A. BUCKLEY & Co.

THOS. P. CONNOLLY

A. W. NICHOLSON

The Rev

The Superintendent of Education.

LETTER FROM MR. COLLINS

*Dr. Wm. Murray, "Mountain View,"
Lynchburgh, Campbell Co., Virginia,
September 18th, 1876.*

DEAR SIR,—Referring to my communication dated 14th of this month regarding series of school books published by our firm, I have just been advised that a new and enlarged edition of the "New Illustrated English Readers" have just been published, a sample set of which we shall be glad to send you for inspection.

It has occurred to me, that instead of waiting for a reply from Glasgow, should there be any information you may desire to have and in my power to furnish, I shall be glad to reply at once to any communication you may favor me with at above address.

I shall have occasion to visit Halifax on business connected with our firm late in November of this year, when I shall have the pleasure of waiting upon you. Should you prefer to see me earlier, however, I could without the slightest personal inconvenience proceed to Halifax at once, and if my doing so would in any way facilitate deliberations on the subject, I would much prefer to wait upon you now.

A reply by return mail to above address, if convenient, would greatly oblige.

We are, dear Sir,

Your obedient servants,

(p. p.)

WM. COLLINS, SONS & Co.

Signed

JAMES McDONALD.

The Secretary Education Office.

Halifax, N. S.

LYNCHBURGH, VA., 28th September, 1876

Secretary Education Office, Halifax :

Please answer letter whether my presence in Halifax would be useful now.

JAMES McDONALD

LETTER FROM DR. FARISH.

YARMOUTH, December 26, 1876

Rev. A. S. HUNT.

My Dear Sir,—I have just received your note respecting the Reading Books, and must confess that I am puzzled what to think

of it, in the face of a telegram from the Education office, of Dec. 6. I will just tell you the whole story, perhaps you can unravel the whole mystery. If I have in any way acted contrary to your wishes, be assured I thought I was complying with your orders.

About the 1st September, I received from Mackinlay, a parcel containing a set of the Royal Readers, 1 to 6 inclusive, and a set of the Wall Cards, with a request to introduce them into the Schools, stating *I think*, that they would be prescribed. I have mislaid the letter and am not sure of his words. However, under the impression that they were to be prescribed, I went to the Bookseller and asked him if he would import them; he said, "decidedly not; he had a cart-load of Nelson's on hand, and he wished to get rid of them first; he would do nothing to injure the sale of those on hand; he was willing to *exchange* with Mackinlay for the new ones, nothing else." I wrote to Mackinlay, and so did the Bookseller to that effect, and there the whole matter dropped.

During the autumn I frequently spoke to all the teachers of the Town Schools about the books, and they unanimously expressed themselves pleased to have an addition from which to select reading books, *as soon as they were prescribed*. I had only once accidentally heard of the Collins' Series, and did not suppose they would ever be introduced here. I concluded we had to deal only with the Royal Readers or the old Nelson Series.

While in this state of uncertainty, I received the following telegram:—

HALIFAX, Dec. 6, 1876.

To G. J. Farish, M. D., Inspector :

Please send, with your own, names of such teachers and others for petition to Council to-day, as want Royal Readers on prescribed list.

SAMUEL ARCHIBALD.

I received it on the morning of the 7th, and believed I would be too late; but as I *might not* be, I resolved to send the names of those teachers with whom I had conversed, and who expressed themselves desirous of having the books. I thought that the Council of Public Instruction might not have met on the 6th, but I had no time to see them, and therefore immediately telegraphed as follows:—

"Inspector, G. J. Farish; Teachers, A. Cameron, J. Munro, J. Mackay, M. Webster, L. Goudey, A. Starratt, M. Starratt, E. Young, M. Woodworth, J. Page, H. Crosby, M. Taylor, D. Landers, H. Ellis, L. Bent, J. Harrison, A. Trask, E. Killam, R. Woodworth."

This course I believed to be in accordance with your own wishes, and that *you* required that the Royal Readers should be placed on the prescribed list.

You will see, then, in answer to your enquiries, "Who were the movers in the petition to the Council?" and "Who was the moving spirit in the matter?" that there was no such person in Yarmouth to my knowledge. I acted on the telegram, and as I thought, according to your orders, expressed through your clerk.

A short time ago I received a parcel containing the Collins' series, with the catalogue; but as the holidays just then commenced and the schools had closed, I have had no opportunity to show them to any but a few teachers who visited my office on other business. I have both still in my possession, and am prepared to encourage whichever series you think preferable.

This is all the light I can throw upon the subject.

I have forwarded the small condensed returns of the Yarmouth schools, and am now drawing up my report. This I shall send soon, together with the abstracts.

Wishing you all the compliments of the season,

I am, dear Sir,

Yours very sincerely,

G. J. FARISH,
Inspector.

REV. MR. HUNT'S REPLY TO CHARGES.

Read by him June 5, 1877.

I have deemed it advisable, under the peculiar circumstances of this case, to reduce to writing my reply to the various charges preferred against me, and which are now under investigation.

Several of these charges are, that I changed the marks upon the examination envelopes, and mutilated and concealed some, fraudulently substituting others in their places.

In support of these charges certain envelopes, said to be the mutilated and changed ones, were produced by Mr. Archibald.

At the investigation I contented myself with stating that the charges based on the envelopes could be easily explained, but reserving that explanation until Mr. Archibald had concluded his case against me. Those envelopes, as I supposed, were left in the Treasurer's office, where the investigation had been held, and where they had been produced. Some days after, on going into the room with the Hon. Mr. Robertson for the purpose of inspecting them, I was surprised to find that they were not to be found, and the most diligent search has failed to discover them. In the room I observed a paper which I recognized as the wrapper that had been round the envelopes, on the inside of which there was a memorandum in Mr. Archibald's handwriting to the following effect, if not in these exact words: "Torn envelopes, only to be

used if absolutely necessary." It may be that these words furnish a key to the loss of the envelopes, and that having discovered that the story fabricated out of them would not bear the light of investigation and truth, they had been carried off as the easiest solution of the difficulty. Be that, however, as it may: in the absence of the envelopes I take it for granted that the Government would expunge out of the evidence, and leave out of their consideration, all the charges based on them. But that is not enough for my purpose. Stories prejudicial to me personally, and detrimental to the management of the Education office, have been industriously circulated by interested parties, and I am not content to be deprived of the opportunity of proving how utterly groundless those charges are, or to lie under a stigma that but for the absence of those papers could have been most satisfactorily removed; and I trust that the Government will use every endeavor to discover when and by whom the missing envelopes were abstracted.

In regard to the torn envelopes said to have been taken out of the stove, I most positively deny that they were the covers of any of the examination papers of the year 1876. All examination papers are carefully preserved for one year, after which time they become the perquisites of the keeper of the office, who takes the papers out of the envelopes and sells them, but destroys or otherwise disposes of the envelopes, which being yellow, are unsaleable. Those envelopes, therefore, so diligently ferreted out and so carefully patched up by Mr. Archibald, were those, not of examinations occurring in 1876, but of previous years.

The first charge made is that I altered Dr. Ross's figures on the envelopes for No. 24, Station G, Dr. Ross having marked 15, 35, 35, total 85, and that those I had altered by changing the figures one into three, thus making the marks read 35, 35, 35, total 115. Was this envelope produced it would show no evidence of having been tampered with, or that Dr. Ross's figures had been altered. Owing to the multiplicity of examination papers and envelopes, it sometime happens notwithstanding all possible care that an envelope gets into a wrong set, that is, that one is exchanged for another. This will explain why the envelope produced differs in its results from the record kept by Dr. Ross.

The next charge preferred is, that I procured from Rev. Mr. Daly duplicate envelopes showing different results of the same year's work. Mr. Archibald produced three envelopes, several dilapidated and torn, taken, as he said, from the stove, which bore the Rev. Mr. Daly's genuine signature; the others and corresponding ones taken from their proper place, also bearing that gentleman's genuine signature. Those signatures could not be on the envelope of one year without forgery on my part, or fraud on the part of Rev. Mr. Daly; but the Rev. Mr. Daly in his evidence positively affirms that he never signed envelopes in duplicate, and I as positively assert that I never on any occasion or for any purpose signed the Rev. Mr. Daly's name to any document what-

ever. The solution of the whole matter is simple and easy; the three envelopes belong to the examination of different years, and this could be easily verified by turning to the record, were the envelopes referred to not missing.

I pronounce the second charge of changing the averages untrue in every particular, and this could be substantiated beyond all cavil or doubt, were the envelopes on which the charge is based, produced.

I am also charged with concealment of envelopes, particularly in the case of Station G; it is insinuated that I held the original envelope until I had had an opportunity of seeing Rev. Mr. Daly, and procuring from him one showing different results, which I substituted for the original one, this I positively deny, and for corroboration refer to the statement of Rev. Mr. Daly, that he never signed duplicates or substituted envelopes. I never applied to him for duplicates. It some time happens that one envelope of a set goes astray, and gets mixed up with some other set, in which case the whole set from which one is missing is laid aside, until the missing one is found.

This is probably the explanation of the case referred to. In all those cases I must have, indeed, I am charged with having, acted in complicity with the Rev. Mr. Daly; if I am guilty he is participes criminis; but he has purged himself of all wrong doing or complicity with me in wrong doing, and his testimony ought surely to turn the scale even should my testimony be deemed as no more than balancing that of Mr. Archibald. The excuse attempted by Mr. Archibald for charging the Rev. Mr. Daly as an accomplice in delinquencies on my part in tampering with the envelopes, is that he was the only one of the examiners who did not keep a record, and therefore I could work through him with little fear of detection; but apart from the gross insult, such an insinuation is to the Rev. gentlemen who has filled the office of examiner ever since the inauguration of the present system, and whose character for honesty and integrity has been unchallenged until thus aspersed, I have reason to know that Mr. Archibald is incorrect in the statement that the Rev. Mr. Daly is the only examiner who does not keep a record; moreover I believe that all the envelopes said to be charged as altered and tampered with by Mr. Daly's connivance, referred to Protestant candidates, so that he would appear to have little inducement for the perpetration of a connivance with the alleged fraud even should the reputation of a life time be held no guarantee that his official duties would honestly and faithfully be performed. Again, I have been charged with having altered the average of spelling so as to enable parties to obtain a license whose spelling was not up to the required standard. The spelling is a regulation of the Council of Public Instruction, and they can at pleasure lower or raise the standard. By a regulation of Council, no one was entitled to have a first-class license no matter how highly qualified in other respects who had more than six words badly spelt. This on occasions was felt to be a great hardship, and complaints were made of the severity

of the regulations to the Council of Public Instruction by those who had spent a large amount of time and money in preparation. The Council of Public Instruction on considering the matter, left it discretionary with me to make such allowance for bad spelling as I shall see fit. I have, therefore, in some instances, in the case of Normal School students, but only where the examinations in other respects proved to have been exceptionally good, allowed a failure in spelling of more than the limited number of six words, and for so doing, the following resolution of the Council of Public Instruction is my justification:—Extract from minute of Council passed August 18, 1874, "The Honorable Wm. Vail stated that he had received several communications from Normal School pupils, complaining that while they had made the required average for the grade sought, they had been prevented from obtaining their license, in consequence of a few misspelled words. The Superintendent of Education explained the regulation of Council on the subject; a conversation followed when it was decided to leave the matter to the discretion of the Superintendent."

In reference to the charges preferred of having given out examination papers of a coming examination, I beg to submit that it was the custom of the office in the time of my predecessor, as I learned on taking office, and which has continued to be the practice since—to hand over to parties requiring the same, sets of papers of previous examinations, without enquiry as to uses intended to be made of them. In so doing there is no irregularity, and nothing in contravention of the Education Act or of the regulations of the Council of Public Instruction. The gravamen of the charge must therefore be, that the papers were those of an approaching examination, and that they were parted with with the intention of favoring one candidate over another. A charge so grave as this, and aimed so directly at the integrity of one holding the important and responsible office of Superintendent of Education, and preferred by a subordinate in the office, ought surely not to have been hastily made; and if made, ought not to be entertained by the Council of Public Instruction unless supported by proof at once clear and positive. But an examination of the evidence of Mr. Robertson, the only witness produced in support of the charge, most assuredly does not bear out in any way the allegation. In the first place, Mr. Robertson does not say he obtained the papers, alleged to have been received from me, prior to an examination. Indeed, he does not pretend to fix the time more definitely than to say that he received them last summer—a period sufficiently large to embrace within its limits a time both before and after an examination. Again: Mr. Robertson admits that he had no knowledge of the contents of the papers received by him from me, and therefore frankly states that he cannot say that the papers I gave him were examination papers of an approaching examination; nor does the fact that he sent them to an intending candidate through the medium of a third party of itself prove anything, inasmuch as parties are

often in the habit of applying for and receiving questions of a past examination as a guide in preparing for an approaching examination. What remains of Mr. Robertson's testimony is a statement that he had reason to believe that I gave him examination papers of an approaching examination, but on what he bases that belief it is hard to determine, when he immediately qualifies that statement by admissions that denudes it of all value, namely—that he had no knowledge of the contents of the papers received, and had previously unequivocally stated that I had made no statement as to the nature of the papers I handed him. And of a like kind is the admission drawn out of him by Mr. Archibald at a time when he appears to have been engaged in plotting against me and diligently hunting up evidence which he trusted to use to my disadvantage—that I had given him (Mr. Robertson) what he believed to be examination papers. Supposing them to have been examination papers, what then? Their so being would prefer no charge against me, unless they were proved to be examination papers of an approaching examination, and given to favor a candidate, which Mr. Robertson has not ventured to state, and of which the evidence furnishes no proof apart from the belief of the witness,—the reasons for which he has not stated, and which the evidence given by him shows could rest on no solid basis. Your honorable body cannot but be of opinion that the charge against me has not been sustained by any evidence that in any principle of law or equity would call on me for reply.

But I am not willing to leave this part of the case, resting my defence on the fact that the charge against me has completely broken down, and I therefore beg to submit the following statement :

"There was nothing strange in my having given Mr. Robertson examination papers on the occasion referred to; he had been in the habit of applying to me for old questions every year, and I had freely supplied him. These, I understood, he filed away and preserved; and I was under the impression from his frequent private conversations with me, and also from his desire to review examination papers, that his sole object was the improvement of his own mind—a desire which I never hesitated to gratify.

"His father being a member of the Government, and he employed in Government offices, precluded the idea that any papers which I gave him would be used for the advantage of any particular candidate or to contravene in any way the Educational laws."

The charge made against me in connection with Miss McIntosh, is of a character so flimsy and unsubstantial as to be hardly worth the time and trouble of refuting; and I only refer to it in order that your honorable body may from it be enabled to judge of the character of all the charges made against me, and obtain some better insight into the vindictiveness of the spirit that has trumped up such counter charges as an off-sett to charges preferred by me against Mr. Archibald.

Miss McIntosh holds a license of grade B, a 1st class male license, obtained in 1870, at the Normal School, and hence any increase in her "average" made at any subsequent examination would not entitle her to an additional claim on the Government grant or on any other school fund. I may also remark that since 1870, Miss McIntosh has been employed in the City Schools, and is deservedly regarded as one of our best city instructors. On several occasions Miss McIntosh intimated to me her wish to be examined, that she might obtain a higher average. I, of course, encouraged her to do so, and distinctly remember at several times during the past two or three years, saying "Well, Miss McIntosh do so, take an examination for a higher average, and I will do any thing in my power to make it successful." To give the questions was not in my power, hence I had no such intention, but in consideration of Miss McIntosh holding already a 1st class male license, and also of her being so constantly engaged in her school duties, I could tell her what book to study in her preparation, and what especial branch should receive particular attention without in any way violating the obligation of my office. I have to regret that Miss McIntosh so misunderstood the language I employed, as I had no intention of giving her the questions, nor do I remember that I told her to call at the office as stated, but if such was the case, I merely meant to say that when the questions were published I would give the information above stated.

Your honorable council will bear in mind that this young lady's testimony only relates to what she considered my *intention* to be. The questions, most assuredly, were not given, nor is it claimed that they were, nor has Miss McIntosh been examined since 1870. The charge therefore rests upon what my intention was supposed to be; I must express my regret that my language was misunderstood, and again affirm that I had no intention of giving the questions as Miss McIntosh seems to have expected.

I have thus succinctly gone through the main charges preferred against the management of the Education Office, and I think that I have clearly shown that they are recklessly, if not vindictively made, that they rest on no basis of truth, and are sustained by no evidence, and I cannot forbear calling the attention of the Government to the animus of Mr. Archibald as evinced by the tone and style of his summing up in writing now in the hands of the Government.

The evidence is distorted, and in many instances falsely stated, while almost every line contains an insult or some sly insinuation or inuendo in regard to myself. Now, while I by no means challenge the right of Mr. Archibald to complain to the Government of any irregularities committed or permitted by me in the execution of my office, and am not disposed to quarrel with him for laying the charges before the Government, without first calling my attention to them, yet I submit that the language used is not such as should be used by a subordinate to the head of a department, and shows a maliciousness towards me that renders it plain that

zeal for the public service, and a desire to reform abuses were not the main spring that prompted his action, and lends probability to the statement he has made, that he was there as a spy upon me, and possibly was not an unwilling tool in the hands of crafty and designing men. Although Mr. Archibald says he made complaint to the Hon. Mr. Hill in September last, of what he considered an irregularity in the examination work, yet I was not made aware of his having done so, nor were any specific charges formulated until after I had memorialized the Government on his conduct in the office, yet months before he had been plotting against me, and hunting up evidence in proof of which I beg to refer to the statement of Miss McIntosh where she says, "Mr. Archibald had given me every information about Mr. Hunt's irregularities, and he drew the statement from me (contained in her evidence), and also says Mr. Archibald first spoke to me of Mr. Hunt's irregularities in April of last year or earlier;" and the Government will give weight to the fact that in his anxiety to make out a case against me, he called several witnesses whom he was himself obliged to admit, proved nothing, and in like manner I submit that all his allegations have failed, and although the envelopes are missing, fortunately my statements are corroborated by the evidence of the Rev. Mr. Daly, who testifies that he never altered or duplicated an envelope, and that on only one occasion since he has filled the office of examiner was he ever requested so to do, and that was not by me.

And in this connection I beg to remind the Government of one of my charges against Mr. Archibald, that he took papers and envelopes from the office and kept them away for months, and at last only returned them after repeated demands for them had been made by me. And the Government will see how impossible it is that I can hold myself responsible for the papers of the office when my subordinate is guilty of an action so reprehensible. In this connection I want to remark that in every instance of computing the averages upon which licenses are granted, my memoranda was handed over to Mr. Archibald with instructions "to look carefully over the work, and if any corrections are required, to make them, or to hand them back to me for correction." If, therefore, an error should escape my notice, and my clerk see it and fail to act upon his instructions, upon him, more than upon me, should rest any consequences that may result from such errors.

And I may further submit that the charges to which I have now replied were preferred several weeks subsequent to the presentation of a series of complaints which, under a sense of duty, I was compelled to make against Mr. Archibald, and which are yet to receive the consideration of your honorable body. The charges against me, so unfounded and unjust, were doubtless designed to offset, and, if possible, diminish the weight of my accusations. Hence I cannot but regret that your honorable body gave a priority to Mr. Archibald, as it has, to a considerable extent at least, protected your deliberations.

In conclusion, I have only to leave my reply to the charges made against me in the hands of the Government, assuring them that in no case have I ever been guilty of any irregularities in the performance of the duties of my office, nor have I wittingly violated the law or infringed any of the regulations of the Council of Public Instruction.

But in view of the conduct of Mr. Archibald and his insubordination, of which the members of the Government have had ample proof, as well as of the charges preferred by me against him, the Government must, I feel assured, see how exceedingly unpleasant my official position has been made, and the difficulties by which I have been surrounded in consequence of Mr. Archibald's constant and unprovoked aim to circumvent me in the discharge of some of the most important duties of my office.

MR. ARCHIBALDS' WRITTEN SPEECH TO THE COUNCIL.

Having endeavored to substantiate by proof the charges preferred against the Superintendent of Education, it now devolves upon me to follow up that proof by such a statement as will bring clearly to your notice, with what necessary proof has been presented. In doing so, I shall endeavor to follow the charges as nearly as possible in the order of their number, particularizing the point to be proved in each.

By the first charge, the Superintendent is accused of falsifying the valuation of two of the Provincial Examiners by preparing memos. for license bearing larger numbers than these examiner's envelopes. The two examiners referred to are Ross & Daly. In the case of Dr. Ross the charge has been proved true only as respects one candidate, viz.: No. 24, Station G, in whose case the envelope shows the following figures: 15, 35, 85, total 85, while the Superintendent's memos. shows the same valuation for all the branches or subjects, viz.: 35, 35, 35, total 105. It will be remembered that the Superintendent, when the envelope and memo. were compared, sought to throw the blame of the discrepancy upon me by calling attention to the blotting out of the Station No. as first written, and saying that a designing man could very easily substitute another envelope of the same station for the original one of this candidate. Possibly he might have succeeded in throwing discredit upon the proof in this case, and perhaps also in impressing some of you with the idea of a plot on my part against him had that envelope itself been my only recourse. Fortunately, however, the painstaking of the examiner placed that beyond his reach, the *private record* showing figures corresponding with the envelope and not with his memo. By no pos-

sibility, therefore, can his diabolical insinuation and charge be fastened upon me.

With respect to Father Daly's envelopes, it is difficult to go astray for proofs of this or any charge relating to examiner's work. In the case of No. 24, Station G, a comparison of the memo. and original envelope of the candidate shows the total of the former to be 160, while that of the latter is 230. As there is a duplicate, however, of this envelope which requires that it be spoken of elsewhere, we will refer you to No. 98, Station W. The history of Geography envelopes of this candidate shows the total of the examiners marks to be 60, while that of the Superintendent's memo. is 280, or 4 times the valuation of the Provincial Examiner. The grade of license given this candidate by the Superintendent is that applied for, viz.: grade C, while that to which the examiner's valuation would entitle her, is only grade E, two grades lower. The amount of Provincial money to which she is entitled is \$22.50 per term or \$45 per year, while the Superintendent in his liberality would double that amount to her; give her \$90 of the public money. Now is this the only evil in the case? By granting her license two grades higher than she is entitled to, he perpetrates the additional fraud upon the people of this country of sending forth an incompetent of the very lowest grade, leaving in her hands that which ought to be to them the highest guarantee of scholarship and teaching ability, a Normal School license, by means of which she is placed in a position to receive a very much increased salary from the people, though unable, by reason of inefficient scholarship, to render them the service for which they agree to pay her so much; and moreover the children and youth of our country are defrauded for all time of that mental training and discipline which the trustees employing her had the right to expect they would receive at her hands. Were this a solitary instance of the fraud perpetrated, it would, however, be a matter of less grave concern, but when it is known to be only one of a large number of similar cases of the one year's examination work, who can compute the untold and untellable mischief which has resulted to this Province during the seven years of his occupancy of the office of Superintendent of Education?

Perhaps as grave a feature as the fraud presents is the ignoring of such numbers of misspelled words as is so apparent in the case of very many to which your attention has been called. Can anything indicate more unmistakably than bad spelling the lack of training and scholarship which ought especially to be found in those going forth throughout the country as first-class teachers? There can be no more radical defect; and there is the less ground for any excuse in the case that it is a defect at all times so glaring and palpable to those who are themselves able to spell correctly. Were the present state of matters perpetuated it would require no prophet or prophet's son to announce beforehand the self-evident prognostication that many years could not

clapse before the spelling of the Province would be reduced to the level which has made so notorious the spelling of the Education Office.

The second charge preferred against the Superintendent is that of altering the figures of Examiner Daly over his own signature. This charge, though one of so grave import, constituting as it does a crime punishable by law, as well as a grave offence against the special enactment which, in all its details, the Superintendent is sworn to administer righteously, is at the same time one on which it is not necessary that I dwell at very great length, for the simple reason that the proof is so convincing and covers exactly the same ground as the first charge, so far as Examiner Daly's envelopes are concerned. The proof, therefore, of charge No. 1, as respects this Examiner's envelopes, is also the proof of this charge. Every liberty seems to have been taken with this Examiner's work. If any alterations were necessary to be made in order to accomplish his purpose, Father Daly's envelopes were those practised upon. With no other Examiner were such liberties taken—a fact, as it appears to me, into which both Father Daly and the Government should institute careful enquiry as to the cause of such a proceeding, which in the minds of not a few is and will be regarded as a circumstance more significant than should prove palatable either to the Government, that gentleman himself, or the clerical portion of his co-religionists in this city. In the case of the other Examiners, he could not so practice upon them with impunity, as they keep a private record which is an effectual check against any such irregularity. It may be, and doubtless is, the fact that no such check is kept by Father Daly, else he would have referred to it to establish the Superintendent's innocency. If he has any such private record as the other Examiner's keep, it will be very easy to determine from it what were the original numbers on these envelopes which now show marks of alteration, as well as those which are spoken of as, and doubtless are, duplicates of the original.

The third charge, which is *concealment of the envelopes mutilated by his alterations*, would require the presence of witnesses at the time in the office for POSITIVE proof. Of these, however, there was none. Apart, then, from the conviction of the truthfulness of it—which the proof of the two preceding charges, and all the circumstances of the case, including the disposition, so strong in the human mind, to conceal guilt, convey—apart from these, my chief proof lies in the fact, which may possibly be now forgotten, that very shortly after I made complaint last September, and received the instructions which I did from the Premier, I told Mr. Robertson that I was unable to make any comparison of one of the memos. and envelopes of Station G, (Baddeck), in consequence of an envelope being missing. Mr. R. immediately told me to ask him for it, which I did, and three days after received an envelope corresponding to the one which had been missing. As this circumstance may be forgotten by Mr. R., the

truthfulness of this charge will be regarded as depending largely upon the proof adduced for the establishment of the two preceding charges. It is but human to conceal guilt. If, therefore, the Superintendent was guilty of the misdemeanors referred to in the two preceding charges, he would naturally conceal the evidence of his guilt, if possible, by placing out of sight the envelopes disfigured by his changes. It has been shown, I think, most conclusively, that he is guilty of the irregularities spoken of, so that the natural inference is that he did conceal the envelopes spoken of. In addition to this logical deduction from the premises--which I trust are regarded as true--you have also my own testimony to the fact specified in charge No. 3.

Charge No. 4 accuses the Superintendent of procuring in some way duplicates of secreted envelopes, and handing them over for the original. For the proof of this I claim to have presented before you three original envelopes, once torn in pieces, but now, with the pieces arranged and pasted upon paper, in the position which they held in the envelope when whole. Corresponding with these, bearing the same station mark and number, and showing either the same figures or an attempt to alter to the same, are other envelopes which I have designated as duplicates of those torn ones. That they are indeed duplicates is apparent from the figuring of the Superintendent upon them, which a comparison of the two is sufficient to show is without doubt his work. In the second place, the station mark and number is the same in each of the three cases. With respect to the station mark, which is placed on the envelopes by the Deputy Examiner in every case, as he alone is supposed to be cognizant of what that mark is, a comparison of it as found on the torn and duplicate envelopes with others of the same station will show whether or not both seem to be done by the same hand. For myself I can only say that I saw what was to me very plain evidence of the Superintendent's own hand. In the case of No. 24, Station G, it will be seen that the ending of the g is not such as to make it a very clever imitation of that of the Deputy Examiner, and I doubt not that a similar comparison of Nos. 25 and 98, Station W, will indicate some similar indications of imitation.

That the Superintendent should seek to procure duplicates of these envelopes, when he was called upon for them, in order to further concealment of his guilt, is simply just as natural as for him to conceal them in the first instance. Both were necessary that his guilt in altering the figures of the Examiners might not appear, which in other cases has been sufficiently proved. No. 98, Station W, is the best proof of charges Nos. 1 and 2, but there is no doubt whatever that it had been wanting had it been in the parcel with the others of that station reported upon. That envelope I retained in my own possession, fearing that all evidence of guilt would be removed by duplication of envelopes, as in the case of the three before alluded to, or otherwise that they would be destroyed altogether. But that No. 98 was only one of

many of Station W similarly altered, but which now show a clean sheet, Mr. Bishop's testimony, as well as that of my brother Donald, who saw and compared these envelopes with the Superintendent's memos. and the record more than once will, I presume, be regarded as proof sufficient; so that not only in the case of the three candidates for whose papers in history and geography there are in your possession two envelopes for each, is this fourth charge shown to be true, but in the case of all those of Station W for which you have the Superintendent's memos. Moreover, having procured duplicates to such an extent of Station W envelopes, as Mr. Bishop's and my brother's testimony goes to show, can there be any doubt that the torn envelopes of Stations W and G are indeed the originals, and the others duplicates of them?

Charge No. 5 accuses the Superintendent of having destroyed the originals after procuring duplicates. If charge No. 4 be sustained, as I think it must be, the truthfulness of this charge follows as a matter of course. Where are the originals of all those of Station W to which attention has been called corresponding with the memos. in your possession of that Station, but which now show a clean sheet? No doubt they are destroyed. Since November last, when these envelopes came into his possession, the stove in the office has had fire in it every office day. It was not so, however, in September; the other three, torn as you see them, were consigned to the stove, but not to the flames. They bear evidence, however, in their torn condition of his best efforts towards destruction, and doubtless it was not owing to any lack of purpose on his part that the destruction was not complete. At all events, there they are, in their tell-tale, mutilated condition, to bear testimony against him.

The 6th charge is of a different nature from the preceding five. It takes precedence of the others in point of time, so far as the examinations are concerned, but the proof of it, as far as presented, not being within my own observation, and being more difficult to secure, I have placed it last on the list.

The proof of the charge has been brought before you in the evidence given by Mr. Thomas Robertson and Miss McIntosh. Other witnesses were brought forward with the faintest possible hope of eliciting further proof of this charge, but the faintness of the hope was more than realized.

Mr. Robertson's evidence went to show that for the assistance of a candidate for examination of whom he had spoken to the Superintendent, Mr. Hunt, to Mr. Robertson's surprise, handed him an envelope with papers enclosed which he gave him to understand were the questions of the approaching examination. For the assistance of the candidate spoken of they were given almost immediately previous to the examination, and they were sent with the full conviction that they were the papers of the coming examination.

From some of the questions put to Mr. Robertson, appealing to

what he did not know in the matter, certain statements were made by him which at first sight appeared rather to conflict with his general testimony. As these statements, however, related to what he did not know, they cannot be regarded as counteracting positive evidence. A man's ignorance can in no way be regarded as throwing discredit upon the knowledge which he possesses. Knowledge is knowledge, and the lack of real knowledge is simply ignorance. They stand separate and distinct. Any amount of statement, therefore, grounded on ignorance from lack of personal inspection or from inability to distinguish new from old questions because both were unknown to him, cannot be regarded as conflicting against or weakening his positive evidence that the Superintendent gave him what he represented as the papers of the approaching examination, and which were given with a view to rendering such assistance to the candidates as Mr. Robertson did not dream of procuring. I take it, therefore, that Mr. Robertson's evidence must be regarded as conclusive to the giving of the papers beforehand by the Superintendent.

The nature of Miss McIntosh's evidence is exactly similar with respect to the charge of offering to give papers beforehand. She testified that the Superintendent offered to "do all in his power to make her examination successful," and that he told her to "come down to the office about three weeks before the examination, when the papers would be ready." Either of these statements, taken alone, is more than suspicious of his real intention even apart from any knowledge of what the Superintendent could do or has done in such cases. What legitimate power has the Superintendent to make any candidate's examination successful? Simply none whatever, and any power which he may promise to or actually does exercise is a power exercised partially and unlawfully. He does not pretend, I presume, to the possession of an easy and royal road to knowledge, which he can impart on the occasion of a single interview with an individual of a few minutes' duration. Nor will it be regarded as within the legitimate exercise of his power to grant any such aid by books or knowledge to be derived therefrom as to secure the success of a candidate in three weeks from the date of examination. To obtain license of grade B honorably, with an average of 75 or upwards, requires such acquaintance with a large number of subjects as can only be obtained by long and laborious study under the tuition of one himself competent and worthy of the grade for which he instructs another, if tuition is at all employed. But if it were intended that in the case of Miss McIntosh the necessary preparation should be obtained in a legitimate way, why speak of examination papers at all? Especially, why should the conversation turn upon and continue and end with the examination papers, and not be concerned about any legitimate means of acquiring the knowledge necessary for the successful procuring of the license applied for? As I take it, the statement of Miss McIntosh must be regarded as tantamount to a real offering to

give the papers to her when the three weeks spoken of before examination should have arrived.

Before closing the case I may be allowed to add that as the Superintendent, being a sworn officer of the Government and has been spoken of during the course of this trial as always on his oath, any statement which he may make may on this account be regarded as worthy of more credence than an ordinary statement. I wish it to be understood, therefore, that the statement which I now make I regard as equivalent to sworn testimony, and such as I am prepared to make on oath before any tribunal. I accordingly testify that for the last two years and a half irregularities have constantly come under my notice in connection with the work of the examination which I would long ago have considered sufficient to bring to your notice, as I regarded them sufficient to warrant his removal. I was deterred, however, from doing so by the personal advice of my brother, to whose notice I had brought every detail of an irregular nature from the time when irregularities first became known to me in the office. The irregularities complained of in the charges preferred and now under investigation were of so heinous a character as he regarded admitted of no longer being kept secret, and by his direction I brought them to the notice of Messrs. Hill and Robertson in September last. With respect to the envelopes which I claim to be duplicated, I am willing to attest that as far as regards No. 98, Station W, the torn and mutilated envelope is the original envelope which contained the candidate's work when it came into the office, and that along with it I took the fragments or pieces of No. 25, Station W, and No. 24, Station G, from the stove in the office.

I also assert that the record which I took of envelopes before they passed to Mr. Hunt's hand was a true record of the valuation of the Examiners as presented by the envelopes when they came to the office, and that the figures which they now bear are alterations made by the Superintendent, as indicated by their correspondence with the memos. as made out by him.

If the evidence which I have adduced of the truthfulness of my statements and of the charges preferred be not regarded by you as sufficient evidence of such truthfulness on the one hand and guilt on the other, I feel it to be my duty to ask, not only in order that I may be myself exonerated, but for the satisfaction also of the Government, that one and all of the Provincial Examiners be called in, and the disputed papers submitted to each one in turn and separately without the envelopes, in order that such a valuation may be given them as in the judgment of each Examiner they are entitled to receive.

